REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-37 were originally pending. The July 30, 2003 Office action ("ACTION") indicates that claims 1-37 are subject to restriction and/or an election requirement. As indicated below, the applicant has elected, with traverse, to prosecute claims 1-34 in the event that the restriction requirement is maintained. In light of this, claims 35-37 have been withdrawn without prejudice to reserve the right to pursue these claims is a separate application. Claims 6 and 31 have been amended to correct grammatical errors and more particularly point out the subject matter of the invention. These amendments do not add subject matter and correspond to claimed features that the Office has already had the opportunity to examine. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-34 remain pending.

In view of the following remarks/arguments, withdrawal of the rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Election/Restriction Under 35 USC §121

Claims 1-37 stand restricted under 35 U.S.C. §121 as containing two patentably distinct inventions. In particular, the ACTION asserts that the following claim groupings represent two distinct or independent inventions as follows:

I. Claims 1-34, drawn to a method, system, and medium for providing user interface information into firmware on a USB device, querying the device, and communicating the user interface information to a requestor, classified in class 345, subclass 771; and

II. Claims 35-37, drawn to a medium for providing a data structure for fields to describe a USB, classified in class 713, subclass 340.

If examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Office must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims two distinct or independent inventions (MPEP §803).

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claim groups I and II are sufficiently related such that the office will most likely have to search each of the indicated classes/subclasses to perform an efficient examination of the claimed subject matter of either claim group. Thus, even if it were true that these claim groups claim two distinct or independent inventions, as the ACTION asserts, both claim groups can be conveniently searched and examined together without serious burden on the office. For these reasons, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

In the event that the restriction requirement is maintained, claims 35-37 are withdrawn from consideration under 35 USC §1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected subject matter, and claims 1-34 are elected for continued examination.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,289,466 to Bayramoglu et al ("Bayramoglu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,211,870 to Foster. These rejections are traversed.

The Bayramoglu Reference

Bayramoglu, at col. 3, lines 6-32 and the Abstract section, describes a monitor connected by a universal serial bus (USB) to a base computing system. As shown by Fig. 1 of Bayramoglu, and described by the Abstract, and col. 4, lines 35-39, and col. 6, lines 15-18, the "host computer system" coupled to the monitor 102 is "base system B" of Fig. 1. As described, the monitor is hosted over USB bus 126 by base system B. Mechanical buttons for actuation are positioned on the front bezel of the monitor. Responsive to one of the mechanical buttons being pressed, the monitor sends a command over the USB to the base system, which causes the base system to launch an application for controlling monitor attributes. More specifically, referring to FIG. 2 of Bayramoglu, there is shown the monitor 102, which includes a physical button 218 on the front (bezel 206) of the monitor. Bayramoglu, at col. 6, lines 49-53, recites "button 218 is used to provide an indication to the processor 100 that an on-screen display (OSD) should be displayed [by the base system] for configuring the monitor attributes". Bayramoglu, at col. 8, lines 10 through 19, teaches that "[w]hen this button is pressed, a command is sent to the base system B over the USB 126 indicating that the button 218 was depressed. Thereafter, a mouse controlled applet (MONITOR.CPL) is launched for user control." FIG. 4 of Bayramoglu clearly shows that the mouse-controlled applet (i.e., the application and user interface displayed by the base system to change monitor attributes) is stored on the base system. At, col. 11, lines 24-37, Bayramoglu describes "[t]he MONITOR.CPL module 400 is a Windows 95 control panel applet used to set screen attributes. A screen snapshot of the user interface presented by the MONITOR.CPL is illustrated in FIG. 6."

The Foster Reference

Foster uses an application stored and executed by a computer to create a user interface (UI) for a separate device—a remote control unit. The UI is later sent to the remote control unit for display. In particular, Fig. 1 of Foster and col. 4, lines 23-26 teach "a general purpose computer 100, a programmable remote control unit 200, a docking station 130, and a multimedia processing unit 300. To create a user interface for the remote control unit, Foster at col. 8, lines 1-5, describes "the user starts the remote control development software and activates the wizard for learning the commands of the multimedia processing unit. A screen 300 such as that shown in FIG. 3 is preferably displayed on the display 105 of the general purpose computer." For purposes of discussion, Foster at col. 3, lines 38-67, and col. 4, lines 1-6, specifies that figures 3-7 and 9-11 present screen shots of the remote control development program, which executes on the computer.

Referring to Fig. 7, and col. 9, lines 53-57, Foster describes that "the right pane shown a representation 726 of the programmable remote control unit 200, with a representation 721 of the appearance of the screen object in the programmable remote control unit's display 221, the programmable keys 723, and the fixed keys 724." Foster at col. 10, lines 29-34, describe that "a user may add, edit, delete, or reorder screen objects [on the computer coupled to the remote device via the docking station]. Each of these functions preferably may be activated by the user from a Tools menu 920 as shown in FIG. 9." Fig. 10 of Foster shows another screen shot of the remote control development program as displayed on the user interface development computer.

At col. 11, lines 35-62, Foster describes that "[a]fter the user is satisfied with his screen objects, he then downloads them from the general purpose computer 100 to the programmable remote control unit 200." Foster describes that once the remote control unit is docked into a docking station (the docking station may be connected to the computer via USB—Foster, col. 6, lines 4-8), "the user activates a download command from the general purpose computer 100. [...] Once the programmable remote control unit 200 is loaded with screen objects, the programmable remote control unit 200 [...] is ready for use".

Claimed Subject Matter

Claim 1 recites "providing user interface information into firmware on a USB device, the user interface information corresponding to the USB device", and "responsive to receiving a host-specific device request, communicating the user interface information to a requestor." Nowhere do the references of record, singly or in combination, teach or suggest these features.

In addressing claim 1, the ACTION concedes that Bayramoglu does not teach or suggest the claimed "responsive to receiving a host-specific device request, communicating the user interface information to a requestor." Instead, the ACTION relies on Foster for this missing feature, and concludes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. This conclusion is unsupportable.

Foster teaches that a user creates a user interface (UI) on a computer, which is later communicated to a remote control device that is connected to the computer via a USB-based docking station. (Foster does not teach that the remote control unit is "a USB device"). Foster's computer generated UI is clearly described at

col. 8, line 31, as being "from a database of screen objects". Nowhere does Foster teach or suggest that such a database is "firmware" as claimed. It is well known that "firmware" is read-only memory (ROM). Thus, Foster does not teach or suggest "providing user interface information into firmware on a USB device, the user interface information corresponding to the USB device". Accordingly, the combination of Bayramoglu in view of Foster may never "providing user interface information into firmware on a USB device, the user interface information corresponding to the USB device", as claim 1 recites.

For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, claim 1 includes additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For instance, claim 1 recites in part "providing user interface information into firmware on a USB device, the user interface information corresponding to the USB device", and "responsive to receiving a host-specific device request, communicating the user interface information to a requestor." Nowhere do the references of record teach or suggest these features.

Focusing first on Bayramoglu, Bayramoglu teaches that responsive to end-user selection of a mechanical button located on the front of a computer monitor, the monitor will send a command to a host computer system. Bayramoglu's monitor command is not sent to the connected computer "responsive to receiving a host-specific device request", as claimed. Rather, Foster sends a command from a monitor to a connected host computer responsive to end-user selection of a mechanical button. Additionally, Bayramoglu teaches at col. 6, lines 49-51, that the command "is used to provide an indication" to the base station that the base

station needs to execute a particular application for controlling monitor attributes. Bayramoglu, at col. 11, lines 58-60 describes that the "USB.SYS driver **414** simply operates to pass USB commands to a USB hub driver". Thus, the "command"/"indication" of Bayramoglu is nothing more than that, a conventional USB command which is mapped by the host computer to execute an application that controls monitor attributes. Accordingly, the command sent by the monitor to the connected computer is not "user interface information", as claim 1 recites. Moreover, a conventional USB command and not "a host-specific device request [causing] communicating the user interface information to a requestor", as claimed.

With respect to Foster, Foster describes that responsive to placing a remote control unit into a docking station connected to a general-purpose computer, the remote control unit and computer establish a connection that a user can later use to send a user interface to the remote control unit. Foster teaches that the docking station is the USB device, not the remote control unit. Since the non-USB device of Foster (i.e., the remote control unit) includes the user interface, and since the docking station is taught at most to establish a connection between the base computer and the remote control unit for passing data to the remote control unit, the system of Foster may never "providing user interface information into firmware on a USB device, the user interface information corresponding to the USB device", and "communicating the user interface information to a requestor", as Applicant claims. Instead, Foster clearly teaches that "the user activates a download command from the general purpose computer" (i.e., the host) to send a UI to the remote control unit.

For these reasons, Bayramoglu's monitor command that directs a connected computer to execute an application for setting monitor attributes, combined with the general-purpose computer of Foster that generates and sends a UI for display on a non-USB device may never "providing user interface information into firmware on a USB device, the user interface information corresponding to the USB device", and "communicating the user interface information to a requestor", as claim 1 recites.

For these additional reasons, the cited combination does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Bayramoglu in view of Foster by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 2-5 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 2-5 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For instance, claim 2 recites "wherein the user interface information comprises a custom property section comprised of one or more custom property entries, each custom property entry comprising information that corresponds to a respective custom property for the USB device." Nowhere do the references of record singly or in combination teach or suggest this feature.

In addressing claim 2, the ACTION points to Fig. 6 of Bayramoglu to conclude that to the features of claim 2 are obvious in view of the cited combination. This conclusion is unsupportable. Bayramoglu clearly describes at col. 4, lines 23-24, that "Fig. 6 is a screen shot of an on-screen display applet of the invention." For the reasons already discussed, Bayramoglu teaches that the

applet is executed and presented responsive to a command being sent from a monitor connected to a computing device—the command being sent from the monitor responsive to a user selecting a mechanical button on the monitor. It is respectively submitted that this command is not "user interface information", only a signal indicating that a certain mechanical button has been activated by a user.

Additionally, although Bayramoglu teaches that the applet launched by the host computer (responsive to receipt of the command) is used to adjust monitor attributes, this teaching of an applet stored and executed by the host computer is completely silent with respect to "wherein the user interface information comprises a custom property section comprised of one or more custom property entries, each custom property entry comprising information that corresponds to a respective custom property for the USB device", as claim 2 recites. This is especially the case since that the "user information" of claim 2 is stored on "firmware on a USB device" (see claim 1 from which claim 2 depends).

For this additional reason, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 2 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 recites "wherein the user interface information comprises: a custom property section comprising one or more custom property entries, each custom property entry corresponding to a respective custom property for the USB device", and "a header section comprising an indication of the number of custom property entries for which mappings exist in the custom property section." Nowhere do the references of record teach or suggest these claims features.

In addressing claim 3, the ACTION points to Fig. 6 of Bayramoglu as applied to claim 2, and further points to col. 8, lines 30-40 of Foster to conclude

that to the features of claim 3 are obvious in view of the cited combination. This conclusion is unsupportable.

Bayramoglu clearly describes at col. 4, lines 23-24, that "Fig. 6 is a screen shot of an on-screen display applet of the invention." For the reasons already discussed, Bayramoglu's command, which is sent to a computing device responsive to a user selecting a mechanical button on the monitor, is not "user interface information" as claimed. Rather, it is merely a signal indicating that a certain mechanical button has been activated by a user. Although Bayramoglu teaches that the applet launched responsive to the button press is used to adjust monitor attributes, this teaching is completely silent with respect to "providing user information into firmware on a USB device" (see claim 1 from which claim 3 depends), "wherein the user interface information comprises: a custom property section comprising one or more custom property entries, each custom property entry corresponding to a respective custom property for the USB device ", and "a header section comprising an indication of the number of custom property entries for which mappings exist in the custom property section", as claim 3 recites.

Referring to Foster, Foster teaches that responsive to placing a remote control unit into a docking station connected to a general-purpose computer, the remote control unit and computer establish a connection that a user can later use to send a user interface to the remote control unit. The user interface information of Foster is clearly described at col. 8, line 31, as being "from a database of screen objects" retrieved by a general-purpose computer (the remote control unit of Foster is not "a USB device"). This is not "providing user interface information into firmware on a USB device, the user interface information corresponding to the USB device", as claim 1 recites and upon which claim 3 depends. Moreover,

col. 8, lines 26-40 of Foster, merely describes that an end user programs screen objects displayed on the general purpose computer to learn "commands of the multimedia processing unit."

Nowhere do these teachings of Bayramoglu in view of Foster teach or suggest "wherein the user interface information comprises: a custom property section comprising one or more custom property entries, each custom property entry corresponding to a respective custom property for the USB device ", and "a header section comprising an indication of the number of custom property entries for which mappings exist in the custom property section."

For this addition reason, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 3 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 recites "wherein the user interface information is selected from information comprising an icon, a font, a picture, a label, a help page, or a URL." In addressing this claim, the ACTION points to Foster, col. 10, lines 50-65, wherein Foster describes aspects of a UI and actions on a UI generating host computer to download the UI to a remote control unit. However, for the reasons already discussed, this teaching does not obviate the claimed features. For instance, as already discussed, nowhere does Foster teach or suggest the claimed "user interface information" which is stored on "firmware on [the] USB device". Since these preconditions are not taught or suggested by Foster or Bayramoglu singly or in combination, the cited combination can not teach or suggest "wherein the user interface information is selected from information comprising an icon, a font, a picture, a label, a help page, or a URL", as claim 4 recites.

For this addition reason, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 4 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 recites, "wherein the user interface information is in a data format specified by an operating system." In addressing claim 5, the ACTION points to Foster col. 4, lines 54-59 to conclude that these features are obvious in view of the cited combination. This conclusion is unsupportable because this portion of Foster merely recites "[t]he general purpose computer 100 includes a processor 155 which preferably from Intel Corp. (San Jose, CA) and runs may Microsoft Corp. (Redmond, Washington) Windows operating system. In conjunction with the processor 155, the general-purpose computer 100 has a short-term memory 150 (preferably RAM) and a long-term memory 180 (preferably a hard disk) is known in the art." This does not teach or suggest "user interface information [on] firmware on a USB device", as claim 1 recites and upon which claim 5 depends. Rather, this teaching describes an operating environment of Foster's general-purpose computer, which stores user interface information in a database.

Thus, nowhere does Foster teach or suggest the claimed "user interface information" which is stored on "firmware on [the] USB device". Since these preconditions are not taught or suggested by Foster or Bayramoglu singly or in combination, the cited combination can not teach or suggest "wherein the user interface information is in a data format specified by an operating system", as claim 5 recites.

For this addition reason, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 5 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 recites "querying a USB device with a host-specific device request that corresponds to an extended property descriptor, the extended property descriptor being stored in the firmware of the USB device and indicating user interface information corresponding to the USB device", "responsive to the

querying, receiving the user interface information", and "displaying a set of user interface elements specified by the user interface information." These features are not taught or suggested by the references of record.

Bayramoglu describes at col. 12, lines 15-22 that a conventional "Open Host Controller Interface Specification for USB driver" is utilized. The subject Specification at page 9, lines 2-3, clearly describes that "an extended property descriptor is not defined in the USB specification." In contrast to conventional USB commands, "[t]he extended property descriptor includes UI information that pertains to the peripheral device. The UI information can be in any format such as a format specified by an operating system vendor. The extended property descriptor allows OEMs/IHVs to device specific UI information such as store icons, fonts, pictures, labels, help pages, Universal Resource Locator (URL) Internet links, and the like, in non-volatile memory 118 of the device."

In light of the above, a system of Bayramoglu that teaches exchange of commands based on a conventional USB specification may never utilize "an extended property descriptor", which is not specified in a conventional USB specification, and which claim 6 recites. Moreover, Foster is completely silent with respect to use of such an "extended property descriptor", as claim 6 recites. For these reasons, as well as for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 through 5, nowhere do the references either singly or in combination teach or suggest the features of claim 6.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 6 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, the references of record are completely silent with respect to "the extended property descriptor being stored in the firmware of the USB

device". For this additional reason, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

Claims 7-11 depend from claim 6 and are allowable over the references of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 7-11 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 7-11 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 7-11 should be withdrawn.

Claim 12 recites "[i]n a USB device that responds to device requests from a host [...] receiving a GET_DESCRIPTOR device request that specifies a predetermined index", and "responding to the GET_DESCRIPTOR device request by returning a descriptor that corresponds in the USB device to the host-specific device request for a device-specific request code, the descriptor specifying user interface information corresponding to the USB device." In addressing these features, the ACTION points to Bayramoglu, col. 11, lines 37-65, and col. 12 lines 44-65, to conclude that these features are obvious in view of the cited combination. This conclusion is unsupportable.

Bayramoglu at col. 11, lines 37-65, and col. 12 lines 44-65, describes architectural, execution priority, and communication aspects of the system. Although program module and conventional USB device driver communication is taught, nowhere does this portion or any other portion of Bayramoglu teach or suggest "responding to the GET_DESCRIPTOR device request by returning a descriptor that corresponds in the USB device to the host-specific device request

for a device-specific request code, the descriptor specifying user interface information corresponding to the USB device", as claim 12 recites. Instead, Bayramoglu describes at col. 12, lines 15-22 that a conventional "Open Host Controller Interface Specification for USB driver" is utilized. The subject specification, at page 9, lines 2-3, clearly states that "a descriptor" as Applicant claims "is not defined in the USB specification." Thus, a system of Bayramoglu may never utilize such "a descriptor" as claim 12 recites. This is especially the case since the "descriptor" is not defined in the USB specification. Moreover, Foster is completely silent with respect to these features of claim 12.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 12 is improper and should be withdrawn.

If claim 12 is again rejected on a similar basis in a subsequent Office action, it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point out where the references of record teach or suggest such "a descriptor that corresponds in the USB device to the host-specific device request for a device-specific request code, the descriptor specifying user interface information corresponding to the USB device", as claim 12 recites.

Claims 13-15 depend from claim 12 and are allowable over the references of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 13-15 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 13-15 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 13-15 should be withdrawn.

Claim 16 recites "communicating a non-standard USB device request to a device", and "responsive to the communicating, receiving an extended property descriptor from the device, the extended property descriptor specifying user interface information corresponding to the USB device." Nowhere do the cited references singly or in combination teach or suggest these claimed features.

In addressing claim 16, the ACTION concedes that Bayramoglu does not teach or suggest "communicating a non-standard USB device request to a device", and "responsive to the communicating, receiving an extended property descriptor from the device, the extended property descriptor specifying user interface information corresponding to the USB device." Instead, the ACTION concludes that "the obviousness for receiving extended properties (and their corresponding descriptors) to include user interface specific information is shown in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, using Foster. Applicant disagrees. Nowhere does Foster teach or suggest "communicating a non-standard USB device request to a device", and "responsive to the communicating, receiving an extended property descriptor from the device, the extended property descriptor specifying user interface information corresponding to the USB device", as claim 16 recites.

Foster teaches that a user creates a user interface (UI) on a computer coupled to a remote control device and subsequently downloads the UI to the remote control device for display by selecting "a download command", which causes the generated UI to be installed onto the remote control unit. For instance, Foster teaches that responsive to placing a remote control unit into a docking station connected to a general-purpose computer, the remote control unit and computer establish a connection that a user can later use to communicate the UI to the remote control unit. To this end, Foster at col. 6, lines 4-9, that "[t]he docking

station 130 is coupleable to the I/O interface 115 of the general purpose computer 100, preferably in conformance with an interface standard which is common [...] such as serial or USB." Thus, Foster teaches that the USB host computer 100 communicates with the USB docking station device 130 via a conventional USB interface.

Conventional USB interfaces specify standard USB commands and do not specify "a non-standard USB device request", as claim 16 recites. Thus, a system of Foster that teaches exchange of commands based on a conventional USB specification may never utilize "a non-standard USB device request", which is not specified in a conventional USB specification, and which claim 16 recites. For this reason alone, the references of record do not teach or suggest the features of claim 16.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 16 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

As an additional matter, at page 7, "[w]hen a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons." 37 CFR §1.104(d)(2).

The ACTION, at pages 6 and 7, addresses "a non-standard USB device request", as claim 16 recites, by asserting that since these features are "extra or extended to what is shown in Bayramoglu et al, the Examiner takes Official Notice that a non-standard USB request would be used, in order to provide flexibility to receive extended properties." Thus, after admitting that Bayramoglu does not

teach or suggest "a non-standard USB device request", the Office seemingly relies on personal knowledge to incorporate these missing features into Bayramoglu to arrive at the claimed "extended property descriptor specifying user interface information corresponding to the USB device" without pointing to any specific teaching or suggestion.

Yet, for the reasons already provided, the cited combination of Bayramoglu in view of Foster does not teach or suggest any USB command communication beyond that described in a conventional USB specification. Additionally, the references of record are completely silent with respect to any "extended properties" anything. Moreover, for the reasons already discussed Bayramoglu in view of Foster do not teach or suggest "extended property descriptor specifying user interface information corresponding to the USB device"

Accordingly, if this rejection is maintained on a similar basis in a subsequent action, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to supply an affidavit to support this modification to the cited combination to arrive at what the ACTION has already admitted are missing features of Bayramoglu, and features that are recited in claim 16.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 16 and are allowable over the references of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 17-20 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 17-20 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 17-20 should be withdrawn.

Claim 21 recites "an extended property descriptor stored in the memory, the extended property descriptor identifying a set of user interface information corresponding to the USB device", and "a control program module stored in the memory, the control program module being configured to send the extended configuration descriptor to a requestor in response to receiving a host-specific device request at the port." For the reasons already discussed above, the cited combination does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 21 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 22-24 depend from claim 21 and are allowable over the references of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 22-24 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 22-24 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 22-24 should be withdrawn.

Claim 25 recites "receiving a request from an application program for a descriptor that specifies user interface information corresponding to the USB device", "querying the USB device with a host-specific device request to obtain the property descriptor", "responsive to the querying, receiving the descriptor", and "providing the received property descriptor to the requesting application program." For the reasons already discussed above, the cited combination does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 25 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 26-30 depend from claim 25 and are allowable over the references of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 26-30 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 26-30 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 26-30 should be withdrawn.

Claim 31 recites "receiving a host-specific request for an extended property descriptor from a requestor, the extended property descriptor indicating one or more user interface elements that correspond to the USB device", and "responsive to the receiving, communicating the extended property descriptor to the requestor." For the reasons already discussed above, the cited combination does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 30 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 32-34 depend from claim 31 and are allowable over the references of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 32-34 over Bayramoglu in view of Foster is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 32-34 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited

combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 32-34 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-34 are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Oct 30, 2003

By: [signature] Reg. No. 34,658

for Brian G. Hart
Reg. No. 44, 421
(303) 539-0265 x241